

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY

DEC 23 1960

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION
& EDUCATION

A Christian Journal of Opinion

Negotiation in the Berlin Crisis

Senator Humphrey was undoubtedly right when he declared on his return from Moscow that the Berlin crisis was one of those probing actions by which the Russians were trying to discover the weak spots in our defenses, that we would not have to leave Berlin and that there would be no war if the Western allies remained firm and united. The allies have proved themselves to be firm and united, and Senator Humphrey's prediction will undoubtedly be fulfilled.

Even if Western steadiness results in at least the prevention of a defeat, if not a victory, the Berlin crisis must, nevertheless, prompt great uneasiness among thoughtful observers for two reasons. The first is a general one. This crisis is unique, but it is also typical of the crises that are bound to occur frequently in the inevitable rivalry between the two blocs of power. One is made uneasy by the reflection that both sides are bluffing to a certain extent because neither can afford to yield at every threat of war or it would surely be defeated. The question is whether, in this kind of guessing game, one side or the other, or perhaps both sides, will make wrong guesses and the holocaust will result. It is a sobering consideration that prevents complacency when mankind enjoys (if that is the word) its precarious peace through a "balance of terror."

The second and more unique reason for uneasiness in the Berlin crisis is even more sobering. Berlin is obviously of tremendous symbolic significance for the whole Western cause. If it were sacrificed the western European front might collapse. On the other hand, the Russians are not likely to nurse this threat against the West in their bosom, particularly when they have this seemingly plausi-

ble way of turning Berlin over to the East German Government.

Furthermore, the Russians have a more far-reaching purpose in creating this crisis. They are making a final effort to prevent the arming of Germany by their threats. Berlin is not negotiable, but something in this situation can be negotiated, though one has the feeling that the Russians are using the ominous predicted "gap," the period in which we are inferior to them in the possession of intercontinental missiles, to hold us up. We are not in an enviable position. It is the Russians and not we who are "negotiating from strength."

Whatever may be the answer to the present crisis, it is safe to say that the future of a united Germany, and not merely Berlin, is at stake and that some hitherto unheard of concessions must be made on both sides. It may just be possible, as Walter Lippmann hinted after his Khrushchev interview, that the Russians are prepared to pay the price of troop withdrawals from eastern Europe. If they are willing to pay such a price the West must be ready to bargain imaginatively and not from the standpoint of an inflexible stance.

The West cannot afford a neutralized Germany, nor can it afford the withdrawal of its troops, not because these troops are necessary for the protection of either Germany or Europe but because they are symbolic of our involvement in Europe and our intention of making common cause with her. However, it may be possible to negotiate about the placement of guided missiles. Mr. Kennan's original questions about the advisability of the policy of giving missiles to, or forcing them on, our European allies has achieved a new relevance.

R. N.

Vol. XVIII, No. 23, January 5, 1958. \$3.00 per year; 15 cents a copy

CHINA 1958:

THE MANUFACTURE OF A SOCIETY

ALIKE BY SILENCE and by the prodigious fashioning of information, the Communist regime in China is able to conceal the spirit and purport of critical decisions, to mask economic fact and to contrive the self-portrait that it wills to set before domestic and foreign eyes. Certain developments, however, we know in part.

"The Great Leap Forward" combines various economic programs fantastic in their reported and forecasted rates of increase. Substantial evidence corroborates the claims of high-pressure advance in mining and in heavy industries with standard equipment. In ratio to former production, the proximate goal of surpassing British output is impressive, though considered use of per capita comparison should restrain Chinese boasts and foreign consternation. The construction and operation of vast numbers of crude, village-made blast furnaces is attested. But it is difficult to believe that, in this local activity, the supply and transport of coal and ore and the movement of low-grade pig iron could add greatly and consistently to the national totals in usable iron and steel. Is this a crash program for using local scrap, or a psychological device?

The agricultural scene, fatefully important for a nation now nearer seven hundred than six hundred millions and adding fifteen millions net each year to its population, is more complex. Published plans, taking off confidently from a couple of magnificent harvests, attribute the reported and contemplated increases of fifty per cent a year in some crops, even of ninety per cent for all grains and root crops in 1958 over the abundant year of 1957, to astronomical extension of "irrigation," to heightened fertilizing, to multiple cropping and to deep plowing. This would put 1958 at 233 per cent of the pre-Communist maximum, which is incomprehensible to experts outside China. Such gains would require an agglomeration of miracles—technological, social and economic—if not a transformation of nature in soil, weather and man. Machinery is scarcely a factor, even in plans.

We do not know, and we are not sure that the Communist leaders know, the realities of "the people's communes," those new structures for the most radical collectivizing of land and labor by which

constellations of collective farms are united, preferably with a town as well, and by which farmers are assimilated to a wage system. All men and women, 18 to 45, with extensions at will, are subject to militia training and discipline. With the stated purposes of increasing the supply and intensity of female labor and—ominously—of assuring complete economy in consumption, the new system announces as policy what in some communes is already fact: communal feeding, public care of children, separation of spouses during work assignments of a week or more and concentration of myriads of rural workers in barracks. Incredible speed in "communization" stirs questions as to whether the authorities were driven by necessity to jump for instant and utter control over every bit of land, labor and food in quasi-military existence; questions also arise as to what is words and what is actuality. Recent governmental statements indicate modifications or delays, particularly in urban phases of the new undertaking.

What do the disappearing remnants of "private" time and resources, the absolute mobility of all labor under command, radical shifts in housing and further blows at a shrinking and precarious Sunday mean and portend for the churches? Tardy and scant information shows that recent campaigns against "rightists" have displaced many Protestants from responsible church posts and have quickened the pressured intrusion of Chinese-made "progressive" bishops into the numerous vacant posts in the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

Many, though not all, of the visible deeds and audible words of the Chinese Communists profess colossal assurance of wisdom and power to remake society more swiftly and more shrewdly than the Russians have done and to go farther than Moscow has yet ventured. But their industrial and technological resources are only a fraction of Moscow's. Should the picture of achievement and forceful organization of the greatest single mass of mankind be tinted with conjecture that Peking's totalitarian assertion derives in part from need and anxiety? Meanwhile, Peking speaks increasingly with the accent of omnipotence and plunges along the road of Chou En-lai's prediction, made long years ago, that the Communists would "make China over from a family-centered into a community-centered society." That's plenty. But they are doing more.

M. S. B.

THE BISHOP IN BERLIN

WE ARE PRINTING in this issue (p. 190) excerpts from an Advent sermon delivered by Bishop Otto Dibelius in the Soviet sector of Berlin. This was the Bishop's first appearance in East Berlin since the beginning of the present Berlin crisis.

The Bishop's diocese falls in both East and West Germany. At times the Communist authorities have prevented him from visiting his eastern parishes. He has long been one of the boldest voices on the Continent calling for the freedom of the Church and for the freedom of man on a Christian basis. His congregations, which gather in large numbers to hear him in territory controlled by the Communists, share the risks with him.

The Communist-controlled daily, *Neues Deutschland*, commented on his sermon: "The Bishop has abused the pulpit in Germany's capital. He should be aware, however, that his propaganda for aggressive atomic warfare is out of place in the capital, the whole area of which belongs to us." The *Neue Zeit* asserted: "Even Bishop Dibelius will

eventually be prevented from carrying on his 'spiritual warfare.'"

Bishop Dibelius is in no position to suggest a full policy for Berlin or for the two Germanys. But his sermon reminds the policymakers of how much is at stake in the freedom of West Berlin. They should hear him say: "Take warning that you do not change the present order by bringing *new heartbreak over mankind*."

As the Bishop spoke, the pressure on the churches in East Germany was increasing. In recent weeks the churches had to yield the position that they once took so strongly that young people who have accepted the Communist form of initiation ceremony for youth would be automatically barred from confirmation in the Church. Since there is now a possibility of dealing with each case in a pastoral way this may be a gain, but it does not indicate the serious character of the struggle between the Church and the State for the allegiance of youth. Whatever we may think of the adjustments as between governments in the cold war, this spiritual struggle in which Bishop Dibelius is a symbol and a leader will continue. J. C. B.

Americans Abroad: A Christian Challenge

KENNETH W. THOMPSON

AMERICAN PRESTIGE in many parts of the world has never been lower. This is true in spite of the fact that billions of dollars are flowing from public and private sources as signs of American will and capacity to implement world-wide pledges. The past decade has found the United States in transition from isolationism to internationalism and has witnessed commitments in successive waves extending American responsibilities broadly around the globe. NATO, SEATO, cooperation with the Baghdad Pact, the United Nations and over forty military conventions demonstrate the genuineness of this response.

Military advisory groups are engaged in training forces in numerous countries; arms shipments constitute the largest part of American foreign aid. Despite pressure for economy, token forces are stationed abroad as an earnest of this country's dedication to the defense of freedom. Teams of specialists and technical advisors assist foreign governments in the construction of dams, roads, bridges and power plants.

Yet, with all these advances in outlook, we are

still left to ponder the question: What are the causes of this decline in American prestige? A remarkably incisive novel, *The Ugly American* by William J. Lederer and Eugene Burdick (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1958), seeks to answer this question. While the authors draw up a balance sheet of estimates and recommendations in a final chapter, the burden of what is said emerges from a series of illuminating vignettes of Americans serving in various Southeast Asian countries. Real and partly fictitious characters from real and partly fictitious countries march across the pages of the book. They leave an impression of the average American abroad that is far from reassuring. They point to strengths and are simultaneously unsparing in scoring weakness, failures and doubtful conceptions.

The book has a message and a purpose: to rally Americans to fulfill those ends and goals that the authors consider worthy of the national heritage. As the country reaches out in foreign relations, the object lessons of this book seem inescapable for the fifty-nine countries in which two million Americans live and work. This is so even though

Mr. Thompson is a member of the Editorial Board.

some of them may be overdrawn and unfair to many faithful Americans abroad.

Foreign Aid: Problems and Possibilities

It is high time for responsible minds to diagnose realistically the problems and possibilities of foreign aid. All must applaud the bold and unflinching response of Americans to the challenges of the cold war. Historians doubtless will record that the first decade of the cold war witnessed an unparalleled effort of national will and purpose. Indeed, Winston Churchill credits American policymakers with a level of generosity and good will beyond that attained by any previous great power. Yet debates in the last Congress suggest that many thoughtful people would have us re-examine approaches to foreign aid.

Certain obvious reasons are suggested for such a state of mind. In part, the mortgage has come due on public claims and justifications offered in support of past appropriations. Public officials defending policies to the Congress tend to speak in absolute terms. No postwar administration in presenting foreign aid to Congress can point with full satisfaction to its formula for reconciling the reasonable expectations of officials with statements that will persuade large popular assemblies. In consequence, hopes are aroused in order to rally votes for massive appropriations that responsible leaders must know in their hearts can scarcely be realized in practice. Seeds of disillusionment are planted in this way.

Beyond this, however, the Soviet Union, riding the crest of emergent nationalism, has won astounding and repeated victories. Its empire has been swollen by five million square miles; it has brought seven hundred million people within its orbit. China, Indochina and Tibet have fallen under Communist influence, and for the first time in modern history Russian power has become a factor throughout the Mediterranean. A recent poll in democratic India showed Chou En-lai a three-to-one favorite over President Eisenhower, and the Vice President's reception in Latin America was a shameful demonstration of loss of prestige within this hemisphere. Despite immense outlays of aid and technical assistance anti-Americanism has multiplied throughout the world.

These facts prompt any serious person to pose certain relevant, if rhetorical questions: What has gone wrong with American policy? Should there be more or less foreign aid? Are we clear on the objectives of this aid? Is it clear what we seek and what can be reasonably hoped for from the various

programs overseas? Has foreign assistance been responsive to clear-cut and definite needs, or is it prompted solely by a vague, if commendable, humanitarianism to make others like ourselves? What about the heavy stress on military aid, sometimes at the expense of other types of aid? Has the effect of introducing arms and capital increased political and economic stability or heightened instability? Do we know in general what factors contribute to stability and order in the newer countries? If not, are we clear about the effects of what we propose within a single new country? Who within these countries receives our aid and for what purpose? Are too many or too few Americans engaged in technical assistance? Are they the best possible ambassadors for our cause? How do others see us in terms of our people and programs?

The Ugly American puts forward tentative answers to at least some of these questions. Since the answers are advanced in the form of a story or novel, the stress is placed on the human factor. "If we are not prepared to pay the human price," the writers argue, "we had better retreat to our shores." Not more but better Americans are prescribed. "What we need is a small force of well-trained, well-chosen, hard-working and dedicated professionals. They must be willing to risk their comforts and—in some lands—their health."

By stressing privileges before opportunities or responsibilities, our present recruitment program has set its sights too low. A recent State Department pamphlet shows young people boarding sleek airplanes, bound for good, easy living and shopping in exotic bazaars. The myth has spread of living better abroad than at home. In the authors' words, "[the pamphlet] does not have a *single* word which indicates the work will be demanding, not a *single* word to indicate that we are locked in a quiet struggle around the world, and that recruits will be a part of that struggle. It is a pamphlet designed to attract mediocrities." And in this the authors find that we have succeeded.

The "Right Americans"

The thesis of the book is essentially that a nation loses its power and prestige slowly, in minute particles. The cold war is waged in the underdeveloped countries, not in great events but in countless tiny struggles. American prestige, of course, is bound up with technological progress. Ironically enough we are judged by our neutralist friends in terms of material and military successes. Yet our cause must stand the test of other measuring rods as well.

The ability to speak and think together with the people among whom we live is essential. Yet, according to James Reston, "Fifty per cent of the entire Foreign Service officer corps do not have a speaking knowledge of any foreign language. Seventy per cent of the new men coming into the Foreign Service are in the same state." The success stories in the book are of men like Father Finian and the hardy engineer called the "ugly American," who struggle to master their adopted language. In John Foster Dulles' phrase: "It is not possible to understand what is in the minds of other people without understanding their language, and without understanding their language it is impossible to be sure they understand what is on our minds." The Russians are said to know this and "an estimated nine out of ten Russians speak, read and write the language before they arrive on station."

The "right Americans" in the struggle for freedom must, of course, be more than linguists. *The Ugly American* throws doubt on the helpfulness of many types that appear to throng to foreign service: the adventurers, dilettantes, big businessmen, politicians and, particularly, public relations men. The authors note that the needs of struggling and impoverished small states are less for huge, technical projects like dams and irrigation systems. Often, far more than major enterprises, small and manageable projects are required. Chicken and pig-breeding, small pumps without expensive replacement parts, fishing and canning projects, improved seeds, small industries and papermaking plans have the first call. The nature of these needs in turn suggest the type of American who can be most helpful.

A roll call of the "right Americans" can be drawn from the heroic characters in the book. They include a Jesuit priest who lived in the villages, a diplomat who took liberties with protocol to save a country from communism, a major from Texas who prepared for confronting the military tactics of the Chinese Communists by reading and digesting Mao Tse-tung, and a former OSS man who tried unsuccessfully to improve diets by introducing powdered milk. Without exception, they are hewn from rough and unpolished rock. Most are Americans in their natural state who, in the late President Magsaysay's phrase, make "the best ambassadors a country can have." All were dedicated to the point of risking health and treasure; none were above working with their hands.

This is in many ways a harsh and bitter story. It is a liberal book about freedom, ethics and hu-

manity. At the same time it tells of human deprivation, suffering, and official stupidity. It never shrinks from describing the skill and brutality, dedication and ruthlessness of the Communist adversary. Soviet infiltration and cruelty are not implied; they are demonstrated.

The Ugly American gives a running criticism of failures and sordid conduct by supposedly respectable Americans. But at the end of the troubled story it is hope not despair that beckons. "If knowledge of the problem becomes widespread and if the enthusiasm of the people can be aroused, then we can succeed." How to mobilize enthusiasm and lasting dedication is beyond the scope of a single book. This story has chiefly raised the issue. Perhaps others, including religious people, can contribute to an answer.

The Christian Legacy

Certainly the Christian legacy has its special lessons for Americans living abroad. Our task in the public field is to translate the best in the missionary enterprise into secular terms. It is true that foreign policy must operate in the area and magnitude of foreign aid, and here the imperatives of national interest must prevail. American resources are not unlimited. Their allocation is based on considerations of strategy and the potential economic and political growth of those we aid, but once this choice is made the human side of technical assistance comes into play. Our human relations abroad are open to those "gentle civilizers" of mankind: religion, ethics and the liberal values the West has cherished.

Christians who seek for the international equivalent of the clear moral issues that guide them in the race question may find it here. Man-to-man relations in the newer nations provide an acid test for the relevance of faith. When you are the "grand benefactor" and your friend is a humble supplicant the temptation to be less than Christian tests a living ethic to its roots. A good parent who sacrifices nobly for the good of his children runs the risk of obsession with his goodness.

Relations with "the people" of the newer nations should not be viewed through just the prism of our frustrations and bewilderment with other cultures—for there are also unmatched opportunities here. Religion should have something to say about the incentives that cause men to leave safe havens for larger sacrifices, the moral resources that make them persist, and the wellsprings of compassion even in the face of evil. *The Ugly Amer-*

ican insists that the appeal to young men for service abroad must not be in terms of "better living." They argue, rather, that something like the spirit of religious purpose or, culturally, of *la mission civilisatrice*, must infuse the decisions to live among other people. Can religion and democracy provide this? Cynicism and even realism may, for many young Americans, have weakened moral resolve. How to recover this without creating the illusion of an unreal idealism is part of the central question for thoughtful Christians.

Serious and dedicated religious men and women might well concern themselves with this. The crusaders for world government or universal disarmament have served a purpose, but clear and serious discourse and action on a goal more nearly within reach seems worthy of us now. George F. Kennan is probably right when he argues that Christianity is on strongest ground when it speaks to problems of personal relations. This suggests the immediate relevance of the Christian ethic in at least one area of world affairs.

Living in alien cultures with people who are not American calls for patience and moral courage, compassion and understanding, steadiness of purpose and unflinching resolve. Surely these are "Christian virtues" and even a secular book, *The Ugly American*, makes this abundantly clear.

CHURCH NEWS AND NOTES

Dibelius Asks for 'Unity, Peace, Liberty'

The following excerpts are from an Advent sermon delivered by Bishop Otto Dibelius at St. Mary's Church in the Soviet sector of Berlin on December 7, 1958:

"We know what is at stake in and around our island city. In a worship service, we have no actual assignment to rouse a political conversation. . . . Here we have the Church's sacred commitment, and I will not hesitate to prove the imperative reality of that innermost concern. . . . [It] is written in . . . Ezekiel: 'Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the House of Israel. Whenever you hear a word from my mouth, give them warning from Me.' What was first assigned to the prophet as an individual, has come to be entrusted to the whole Church of Christ, God's new covenant people. . . . You are appointed to be his watchmen. Give, therefore, a warning to those whom you are called to watch, to help and to guide.

"... It is openly stated that two millions residents of West Berlin and another fifty millions living in West Germany are requested to enter new

conditions of life *without being accorded any chance to say whether they favor the new conditions or not* . . . Such a handling of human persons is contrary to the destiny of man as revealed in the gospel of Christ. The gospel states clearly that God wants man to be free, because man's faith can only grow and unfold in an atmosphere providing a free decision as man's divine birthright. This fundamental right shall not be curtailed by monolithic power . . .

"The challenge of the day is not presented to Western man alone. Man's destiny in the East is just as poignantly at stake . . . If a new fence of barbed wire is to be set up in the heart of Berlin . . . the last chance will have been lost for people coming from either part of Germany to this safeguarded place of encounter and interchange of thought . . .

"Now it is said that certain affairs of interzonal or rather intersectorial relations might be examined and changed in the new Soviet-suggested process of readjustment. I would be the last to deny the necessity of having adjusted all those relationships that are clearly unhealthy and unnatural in the Christian perspective of life. But take warning that you do not change the present order by bringing *new heartbreak over mankind*. Rather set your minds on removing unnatural conditions by granting what the Church of Christ has been asking for all these thirteen years: Give back to the German people their national unity and along with that unity, peace and liberty!

"It is a clear historical fact, that the same efforts at 'reconditioning Berlin and Germany' were made ten years ago. The results of that gruesome undertaking were too tangible not to be seen by everyone of us. From violence and authoritarian power nothing ever engenders but new violence and new force. . . . Now a Bishop of Berlin's island city finds himself submitted to that word as a *divine imperative*. Confronted with that imperative, with the prophetic saying of the Lord of Nations, I cannot but entreat all those whom it may concern: Abandon the means of coercion, have done with force, give peace and open the way to freedom!

"What is our task on this our day, prior to any other obligation? . . . 'We must pray.' . . . United in prayer, let us face the coming months, quiet in our confidence but no less fervent in our offerings of prayer. Abraham . . . prayed to the Lord: 'If only ten righteous men be found in the city of Sodom, wilt not Thou, O Lord, save the city from destruction?' And God said: 'I will.' . . . Let us translate then the reference of Abraham into the conditions of our larger unit: If ten thousand people come together in making up their minds to pray to the Lord every day, surely God will hear the voices of the ten thousand. Their prayer shall be that nothing be enacted that may bring new heartbreak over mankind. And God will say: 'For the sake of these ten thousand I will save the people.' Will you be one of these ten thousand?"



Saint Hereticus

**A Sure-Fire Way
to Impede Church Progress**

Time was when a new direction in the life of the church could be halted by one or two simple tactics. If you didn't like the Committee on Social Action or you were suspicious of the political allegiance of the superintendent of the Sunday School, you simply whispered the word "socialism" and the Social Action report was rejected and the superintendent's tenure was dissolved. That was Tactic One. If it didn't quite do the trick, you could always go on to Tactic Two, which was sure-fire. You simply called the thing you didn't like "communistic." It didn't matter whether or not it *was* "communistic." Simply the fact that somebody thought it might be was enough to scare people away from it.

I indulge in this bit of near-forgotten history because I discover from my perusal of the daily press that Tactic One and Tactic Two are being revived. They were not dead; they were only sleeping. The Presbyterians, of all people, have recently been accused of being "socialistic" and "communistic." And this is not by some petulant Methodist or disgruntled Episcopalian, but by one of their own number. Here is the proposal that brought charges of "socialism" and "communism" down upon their heads: *a plan to establish a scholarship fund to help finance the college education of children of underpaid ministers and church workers.*

Needless to say, it is alarming to find Christians willing to help one another out like that. Don't get me wrong. I'm all for Christians praying for one another. That's the church's business and there's nothing too demanding about it. But when Christians are willing to dig into their pockets to help one another, this is such a direct indication of actual concern that I begin to get alarmed.

I need not have worried for a moment. When the plan was proposed on the floor of the Presbyterians' General Assembly, a prominent West Coast clergyman got up and denounced the scheme. Said it "smacks of socialism," and then, just so there wouldn't be any possible misunder-

standing, he went on to define socialism as a "prep school for communism."

Tactic One and, right away, Tactic Two. Sure-fire indeed. The proposal was sent back to a committee "for further study."

Now this is splendid news for heretics. The orthodox have really opened the door for us. If we can only continue to use this device, pretty soon we will have the church just the way we want it—innocuous.

Consider how widely the logic of the disturbed cleric can be applied. If it is "socialistic" and practically "communistic" to set up a scholarship fund, think what can be said about other activities in the life of the church. Take this "communistic" notion of sending money to overseas churches (an enterprise sometimes referred to as "foreign missions"). Certainly this will "encroach on the dignity of church workers," to quote our cleric once more, quite as much as he feels it will if help is given to the children of church workers at home.

Such logic provides a wonderful escape from that nuisance every fall known as the One Great Hour of Sharing. This can be safely crossed off the church's activities, since under such a theme certain people almost surely receive what our cleric refers to as "handouts." It is much more Christian to let people starve in dignity or remain illiterate.

In fact, when you get right down to it, the whole benevolence budget of the local church turns out to be a socialist-inspired notion. Imagine people somewhere else getting something for nothing! Their initiative would be destroyed overnight. Pretty soon they'd be keeping coal in their bathtubs. No, the benevolence budget must go. The only people we can spend money on, without being "socialistic" or "communistic," will be ourselves. (What was that latest estimate for wall-to-wall carpeting in the Ladies' Parlor?)

And reflect for a moment on the most highly refined of the communist-inspired notions, the ministers' pension plan. There is a share-the-wealth Russian idea if there ever was one. Talk about "encroaching on the dignity of church workers." Certainly no self-respecting pastor would want to receive a "handout" after he was 65.

It's clear you see, that all of these things go hand in glove with the "socialistic" notion of scholarships for indigent ministers' kids. Take one of 'em, you end up taking 'em all. Much better, surely, not to show concern in any tangible way. Then we're safe from having to do anything about love. All we need to do is talk about it.

P.S. I just discovered the best reason of all to oppose scholarships for children of underpaid workers. It says somewhere else in the same issue of the newspaper that they do that in Russia.

CORRESPONDENCE

"Ill-Tempered Nonsense"

TO THE EDITORS: R. N.'s peculiarly nasty and supercilious chortling over Senator Knowland's defeat ("Implications of the Elections," Nov. 20) is at best in dubious taste in a periodical that would like to be taken seriously as a "Christian Journal." So "poor Senator Knowland was not bright enough . . . to see and seize the popular side of the right-to-work issue." A curious "Christian" critique! Has it occurred to R. N. that Knowland might just possibly have taken position because he thought it was the *right*—not bright—one?

We have more than enough political cowardice. It really doesn't need the encouragement it might receive from people who write ill-tempered nonsense draped in a mantle of Christian authority.

CHARLES B. EAMES
Sauquoit, N.Y.

Outlawry of War and Weapons

TO THE EDITORS: Near the end of his excellent account of the Fifth World Order Study Conference of the National Council of Churches ("The N.C.C. in a Nuclear Age," Dec. 8 issue), K. W. T. [Kenneth W. Thompson] makes an assertion that needs examination. He writes:

Perhaps the present crisis with its spectre of mutual annihilation calls for one approach: the outlawry of war and weapons. But this is a path that our country followed before two world wars, nearly to the point of disaster.

The first of these two sentences is certainly suggestive—if "outlawry" is adequately defined as the process of developing the institutions and attitudes needed for an orderly world community and is not taken to imply some easy adoption of resolutions.

The second sentence is meaningless.

If "outlawry of war" means the development of an orderly world community provided with [the] means and intention to settle international disputes in an orderly manner and to restrain resort to war, the United States was a notable abstainer from the path until after World War II.

If by "outlawry of . . . weapons" is meant reduction of military establishments and appropriations, the United States has moved in general in the op-

posite direction since World War I. There may have been mistaken deployments of United States military resources on particular occasions but that is another matter. It is scarcely to be expected that immediate post-war reductions, from the high level of the final year of all-out war to a level considerably above that of the last pre-war year, should be considered, either by ourselves or by others, as "outlawry of . . . weapons." In alleged power to injure other nations, the level of United States military power has been climbing for forty years.

K. W. T. implies that powerful armaments in the possession of the United States will tend to deter war. If I were to ask him whether powerful armaments in the possession of the Soviet Union or the People's Republic of China tend to deter war, he would probably smile patiently. Yet does not this illustrate the fact that national armaments are competitive in their nature and tend to aggravate competition? It may well be that armaments are not the sole cause of war, but it by no means clear that national armaments provide a secure basis for peace.

If K. W. T. means that some kind of complex transition stage—in which national armaments, wisely used, may help deter war—must be passed through between the present state of international anarchy and the well-ordered world community of our hopes, let him say so. But he should not suggest that an aggravated anarchy of increasing and competing national armaments can offer a foundation for security, justice and peace.

RICHARD R. WOOD
Riverton, N.J.

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion
537 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK 27 • N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*
WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*
ODESSA SOUTHERN ELLIOTT, *Assistant Editor*
M. SEARLE BATES WALDO BEACH AMOS WILDER
ROBERT MCAFEE BROWN F. ERNEST JOHNSON
JOSEPH SITTLER HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
RICHARD T. BAKER J. OSCAR LEE
KENNETH W. THOMPSON WILLIAM LEE MILLER

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HENRY SMITH LEIPER JOHN A. MACKAY
FRANCIS P. MILLER M. M. THOMAS
JOHN BAILLIE WILLIAM F. MAY ROGER L. SHINN
HERBERT BUTTERFIELD

CONTENTS

AMERICANS ABROAD: A CHRISTIAN CHALLENGE
KENNETH W. THOMPSON
A SURE-FIRE WAY TO IMPEDE CHURCH PROGRESS
ST. HERETICUS